

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 5 and 7 have been amended and claim 9 has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Claim For Priority***

Applicants appreciate the Examiners acknowledgement of Applicants' claim for foreign priority based on Korean Patent Application 2000-50546, which was filed in the Korean Patent Office on August 29, 2000. As soon as possible, Applicants will submit a certified copy of the foreign priority document to the Patent Office in order to perfect the Claim for Priority.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 5 and 6 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants amended claim 5 to incorporate the features of claim 1, from which it depended. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 5 and claim 6, which depends from claim 5 are both in condition for allowance. However, for at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants submit that all of claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are also allowable.

***Claim Objection***

Claims 1, 5 and 7 were objected to for containing minor informalities. Claims 1, 5 and 7 have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to overcome the objection to the claims. These amendments were made for the sole purpose of providing proper antecedent basis. These amendments were not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5 and 7, as amended, overcome the stated objection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection of claims 1, 5 and 7 be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

**Claims 1-4 and 7**

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,469,764 B1 issued to Kim, *et al.* ("Kim"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kim fails to disclose a for a liquid crystal display comprising the combination of claimed features including a shading film formed on the insulating substrate ... wherein the shading film has a plane view different from said domain-defining member and overlaps with said domain-defining member at least in part, as recited in claim 1.

Page 3 of the Office Action states that layer 24 is a shading film. However, Applicants submit that layer 24 is the counter electrode. Applicants submit that the counter electrode is not

a shading electrode. Page 7 of Applicants' specification states that a shading film pattern covers the texture around the domain-defining member and Applicants' submit that is terminology is commonly used by those with ordinary skill in the art. Thus, Applicants submit that the counter electrode 24 of Kim is not a shading film, as is commonly known in the art.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-4 and 7. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

Claim 8

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,057,896 issued to Rho, *et al.* ("Rho"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rho fails to disclose a liquid crystal display comprising the combination of claimed features including a shading film formed on the insulating substrate ... wherein said pixel electrode has a height difference ranging from a height difference ranging from a height of said insulating substrate to a height of said shading film, said first insulating film and said second insulating film, as recited in claim 8.

Applicants submit that nowhere does Rho disclose a shading film. Page 4 of the Office Action states that layer 30 of Rho is a shading film. However, Applicants submit that reference numeral 30 refers to a storage capacitor (col. 4, lines 31-32). As discussed above, page 7 of Applicants' specification states that a shading film pattern covers the texture around the domain-defining member and Applicants submit that is terminology is commonly used by those with

ordinary skill in the art. Thus, Applicants submit that the storage capacitor 30 of Rho is not a shading film, as is commonly known in the art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 8. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable.

***Added Claim***

Added claim 9 is directed to additional features of the invention, which are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Applicants submit that claims 9 is at least allowable for the reasons discussed above with regards to claim 1, from which it depends from.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 16, 2003

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Telephone: (703) 712-5365  
Facsimile: (703) 712-5280  
HCP:MMI/jeh

\COM\223964.1